

MINUTES

Technical Committee Meeting

Thursday, March 30, 2006

1:00 p.m.

Conference Room #113

Members Present: Karl Fredrickson, Larry Worth, Mike Brienzo (representing Roger Figard), Virendra Singh, Marc Rosso (representing Randy Hoskins), Public Works/Utilities; Marvin Krout, David Cary, Planning; Ron Schlautman (representing Steve McBeth), James Miller, NDOR; Don Thomas, Doug Pillard, County Engineering; and Mike Heyl (representing R. Thoreson), Health Department

Others Present: Mike Piernicky - Olsson Associates; Steve Burnham - FHWA; Roger Ohlrich, Karen Sieckmeyer, Public Works/Utilities; Phyllis Hergenrader - Friends of Wilderness Park; Dan Norman, HWS Consulting Group; Ron Kratzer, Lincoln Electric System; Ed Ubben, Lower Platte South NRD; Randy El Dorado, Kirkham Michael; Kerry Eagan, County Board; and Jonathan Cook, City Council.

Karl Fredrickson called the meeting to order and roll-call was taken.

Agenda Item No. 1 - Review and action on the draft minutes of the March 2, Technical Committee Meeting.

There being no corrections, Don Thomas made a motion to approve the minutes. Virendra Singh seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item No. 2 - Review of the *Lincoln Lancaster Long Range Transportation Plan 2030 Update* TransCAD modeling activity and recommendations on the Alternative Transportation Network Sketch Plans proposed by Planning Commission for further analysis.

Virendra Singh asked the Chairman if he could address Item 2 and 3 together. Singh said they would be changing the order of the presentation. He would like to give the Planning Department the opportunity to first talk about land use. David Cary said that this was basically an update as to where we are at with the 2030 Land Use. The sub-committee has met to address some issues that came up at the last Technical Committee Meeting. There is a meeting set for next Tuesday, April 4th, for the sub-committee of this Technical Committee to continue those discussions. Hopefully, the committee will be able to finalize those decisions by the next Technical Committee Meeting.

Singh stated that they would like to take a few moments now to talk about the calibration process. Marvin Krout stated that he was confused about the calibration at the last meeting. Krout had been questioning the calibration that had been voted for at an earlier meeting. Krout was not clear as to

what functions, what estimates or projections may or may not have been part of that motion. That was the reason for Krout raising those issues at the last Technical Committee Meeting. Krout wanted to clarify, for the record, that his vote on the calibration stands. He has no reservations about the work that was done that had led up to that vote. His questions had more to do with how the model worked to project future traffic; how did the City's land use assumption feed into that; and whether or not Planning was giving them the right information to run the model. Krout said they are going through that process in a cooperative way and the sub-committee hopes to have unanimity at the next Technical Committee Meeting.

Singh mentioned that the next item that they will be talking about is the alternatives that have been passed on to us by the Planning Commission. Singh turned it over to Mike Piernicky from Olsson's to explain each of the alternatives.

These are the terms that were used in the Planning Commission working sessions that were held March 8th and 9th. From the resulting discussions, Public Works and Olsson's put together several different alternatives that will be running as we move forward to finalize the land use next Tuesday with the Planning Department. Piernicky went to the 2025 Comp Plan approved network and recalled some of the items that were listed and some of the changes between this and what is being called a "Continuing Growth Base Network" or what is being referred to as Alternative A1. The major changes are around the east and south fringes. In the 2025 Comp Plan, they had projected the need for four plus turn lanes with regard to the expansion of those roadways. A significant number of those when looking at the draft 2030 Continuing Growth Base Network, have been reduced to two plus turn lanes as we have moved forward in this model process. Piernicky showed the draft of the Continuing Growth Base Network where you can see along each of the fringes south and east as well as southwest fringe. The blue is representative of two plus turn lane and red is representative of four plus turn lanes. Next Piernicky showed a list of alternatives. The decision was made that the existing two plus turn lane for the central core was a goal that Public Works would like to continue to carry forward. The question was put forth to Public Works, in the working session with the Planning Commission, how do you try to improve traffic flow within the core area of the network? One of the alternatives discussed and subsequently put forth from the direction of the Planning Commission was to look at is the use of potential one way pair studs within the urban core. Piernicky briefly described the pair alternative. (See attached worksheet.)

In the first alternative, A1, the only thing that was added is the east/west one way pairs for Holdrege/Vine Streets and South/A Streets, and then the north/south one way pairs to include 33rd north of "O" Street, 40th south of "O" Street, for southbound traffic and 48th Street for northbound traffic.

In Alternative A2, the previously set of one way pairs was kept as part of this Alternative. The one way pair concept will be continued through all of the alternatives except for the last one. Adding to that, are the six lanes of Highway 6 from I-80 all the way up to I-80 at the Waverley exit. Additionally, we have six laning of Highway 2, running from Van Dorn Street out to the South Street and the East Beltway. This includes the addition of four plus turn lane roadways along Adams, "O" Street, Pioneers and Pine Lake Road. The addition of 98th Street running out to the East Beltway. You will see a lot of the alternatives as we run through them that occur in three areas of town. One being in the northern section. There are two alternatives looked at in different

combinations. There will be alternatives along Highway 2 and along the east. Next Piernicky showed the added alternatives to the Continuous Growth Base Network. Piernicky pointed out the six laning of Highway 6, six laning of Highway 2 and then the additional roadways on the east to four plus turn lanes.

Alternative A3 includes six laning of Superior Street along the north; six laning of Highway 2 to the East Beltway; and the extension of the east/west roadways to four plus turn lanes running basically from 84th Street all the way out to the beltway. There is also the addition of six lanes along 84th from 'O' to Highway 6. Piernicky gave an explanation of the concept behind putting these sets of alternatives together. There were questions from the Planning Commission on 84th and 98th of whether or not we needed to improve both of them as opposed to one or the other. Although it wasn't apparent here, the four plus turn lane design would connect clear to 84th Street and in three of the four instances Pine Lake, O and Adams will be Continuous Growth Base Network. These are already included in sections so it would be a continuous four plus turn lane all the way to the beltway. North 84th Street was looked at as a six lane cross section. This partially came from the 2025 approved Comp Plan network which did show North 84th Street as a six lane cross section.

Alternative A4, has gone back to Highway 6 with six lane cross section, Highway 2 is a six lane cross section; 98th as well as the connectors out to the East Beltway are four plus turn lanes; and north 84th Street stays as a six lane facility. Our network is still showing a one way pair concept in this alternative.

The eastern portion of Alternative A5 stays the same as previous alternatives. Superior being six lanes is no different than in previous alternatives. Where you see the difference in this one is in the proposed to improvements to Highway 2 in a six lane cross section with at grade intersections. The question was put forth in the alternative evaluations that this facility might not require six lanes. However, this will look at grade separations or interchanges at specific locations along Highway 2. Those locations being 14th, 27th, 40th and 56th Streets and their intersections with Highway 2.

Alternative A6 is exactly the same as one of the previous alternatives with the exception that the question was posed what happens if you don't have the one way pair set within the core center of town. That completed the lists of alternatives.

Once we finalize the land use we will be moving forward to run them and come back with the results of those different alternative runs to the different groups. Krout mentioned that "O" Street doesn't show further widening west of the current six lanes. Singh said that what is shown is the direction from the Planning Commission. If the Technical Committee wants to add that particular component, they will take a look at it. Fredrickson said that if it is appropriate, he would like to see a recommendation be made to the Planning Commission that "O" Street is six lanes from the Antelope Valley roadway continuing back out to 98th Street.

Discussion was held regarding the different alternatives and the feasibility of using one way pairs with that much distance (up to 6 blocks) between the two streets.

Fredrickson said that he would like to recommend to the Planning Commission, an alternative showing six lanes on "O" Street from Antelope Valley all the way east to where we are currently

showing 6 lanes in the 2025 Plan. Krout made a motion that a recommendation be made to the Planning Commission that we have “O” Street widening as an alternative, Singh seconded. Motion carried unanimously

Item No. 4 - Briefing on the *StarTran Transit Development Study* planning activity for input in the *Lincoln-Lancaster Long Range Transportation Plan 2030 Update*.

Cary informed the Committee that they have an executed contract. The first meeting of the Advisory Committee, which is the entire StarTran Advisory Board plus six additional representatives from the community, is scheduled for April 6th at 4:00 p.m. in the Police Training Room A in the Hall of Justice. The consultants will be in town from April 5th thru April 7th. There is forthcoming information that they will bring back to this body. They are also putting information on their website probably within the next week which will include the detail for the services. Anticipated completion is January 7, 2007.

Item No. 5 - Status reports on NDOR projects:

- a. **Federal *Safe Routes to School Program* established by SAFETEA-LU and under development by NDOR.**
- b. ***South Lincoln Beltway* project schedule.**
- a. Federal *Safe Routes to School Program* established by SAFETEA-LU and under development by NDOR. Schlautman handed out a memorandum regarding the Safe Routes to School Program. Fredrickson asked if there was funding for local agencies. Schlautman said there could be some funding. There will be a certain criteria on how they will select and prioritize the applications for the funding. Schlautman mentioned that they may set up a committee to prioritize these so it is fair to the state. He also mentioned that a large City could develop their own program and then the State doesn't have to worry about that area. See attached Memorandum for more information.
- b. South Beltway - Status of Schedule and Project Funding.
The main information on this is that all of the earmarked funds need to be there before starting the construction. Right now, they are not there. Krout asked if seven years is the shortest reasonable time to build that freeway segment or is it based on the expectations of how the money is going to flow? Can it be built in a lesser amount of time if the earmarked came in faster? Schlautman said the funds would probably keep it from being built any faster. Fredrickson commented that he thought it was scheduled to be built faster based on anticipated revenue. See attached Memorandum for more information.

Item No. 6 - Other topics for discussion.

There being no other topics, the meeting was adjourned.